RE: Push for a Committment

Bob Benson to: Bill Brattin, David Berry 09/29/2012 03:51 PM

From: Bob Benson/R8/USEPA/US
To:

Thank you for your weekend work! I am also trying to finish up today my review of papers suggested by the SAB Panel on the relation between localized pleural thickening and decrease in lung function.
My choice is the 2-segment curve for the background jobs. Although the background jobs are inddor jobs, they are separated in space from the indoor trionizing jobs and only finished product (or no product) was present in the department. I think that argues for the 2-segment curve as the easiest to explain based on stopping use of Libby ore in 1980. We could also use the space argument to justify a 1-segment approach. However, I like the symmetry of multiple segments across all jobs in the facility. However, I could be easily persuaded for any one of the three alternatives if someone has a better rationale. David, your choice?
It is not clear to me which background curve was used to put the data in tabs for JEM and Table F-4. I can't track back to 0.259 (1972 value) from either the 2-segment or 3-segment tables.
I would like to push out a package that we are happy with by 10:00 am MDT.
I need a final version of the Word document describing the approach, final plots,and the final AM JEM.
I will also need concurrence on the cover email to DC and UC.
I will be in the office and most likely coherent by 8:00 am. David usually comes in somewhat later.
-----"Brattin, Bill" <brattin@srcinc.com> wrote: -----
To: Bob Benson/R8/USEPA/US@EPA
From: "Brattin, Bill" <brattin@srcinc.com>
Date: 09/29/2012 02:24PM
Subject: RE: Push for a Committment
Here is a file with bkg fit to both a 2-segment and a 3-segment curve.
They are almost identical.
Let's just choose whichever one is easiest to explain.
****
Bill Brattin
SRC, Inc.
999 18th Street Suite 1150
Denver CO 80202

Phone: 303-357-3121
Fax: 303-292-4755
e-mail: brattin@srcinc.com

-----Original Message-----
From: Bob Benson [mailto:Benson.Bob@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Saturday, September 29, 2012 1:04 PM
To: Brattin, Bill; David Berry
Subject: Push for a Committment

Here is my suggested plan.

I recasted Bill's meeting summary as a recommended approach. It is attached. I also attached the plot Bill developed using the unweighted calcuations. We need a plot for Background jobs. See my addition to Bill's meeting summary about Background jobs. We didn't talk about Background jobs in the call. I proposed a comparable approach to the track jobs (2-part exponential using all Background jobs as a single data set).

Here is what I am willing (and eager) to send on Monday.

To: NCEA Group,Danielle, and UC Group

Thank you all for the productive discussion last Thursday! We have consolidated the discussion points into a full proposal for developing the JEM based on the arithmetic mean of the IH data sets. The recommended approach and data plots are attached. We will try to answer any questions you have.

We think this recommended approach has the following advantages:

1) It is qualitatively similar to the approach used by UC in deriving the GM-based JEM
2) It uses the IH data in a scientifically defensible manner
3) It uses the information on engineering controls put in place at various dates in a defensible manner
4) The plots show the fits are reasonable

As noted in the discussion of the recommended approach, we do not know if Linda can implement the variance-weighted calculation in SAS. If that is possible, we will use the variance-weighted calculations. If not, we will use the unweighted calculations that we have now.

We do not believe that additional discussion will reveal a superior approach. Therefore, we are asking for your concurrence with the recommended approach by COB October 5 or before.

[attachment "Unweighted segmented exponential fit common b terms.xlsx" removed by Bob Benson/R8/USEPA/US]